

REMARKS

Specification Amendments. In the Non-Final Office Action, Examiner Tran objected to the title of the invention as not being descriptive and for lacking information concerning continuing data as filed under 35 U.S.C. §371 and claiming the benefit of foreign priority. The Applicant has amended the specification herein to provide a more descriptive title of the invention and to provide information concerning continuing data as filed under 35 U.S.C. §371 and claiming the benefit of foreign priority. No new matter was introduced by the amendment of the specification herein.

Drawing Amendments. In the Non-Final Office Action, Examiner Tran objected to FIG. 1 for failing to including descriptive labels of blocks 14-16 and FIGS. 2 and 3 for failing to include a legend as prior art. The attached replacement informal drawing sheets 1/4 and 2/4 include proposed changes to FIGS. 1-3 to obviate Examiner Tran's objection to the drawings. The Applicant respectfully asserts that FIGS. 1-3 are properly labeled by the drawing amendments herein, and no new matter was introduced into the drawing amendments herein. Examiner Tran is therefore respectfully requested to approve the proposed replacement informal drawing sheets 1/4 and 2/4.

Claims 1, 3-16, 21 and 22 Amendments. The Applicant has amended claims 1, 3-16, 21 and 22 herein to correct typographical errors identified in these claims by the Applicant and to overcome an objection of claims 4-22 by Examiner Tran under 37 C.F.R. 1.75(c) as being in improper form, and NOT to overcome any rejection of claims 1-22 by Examiner Tran. No new matter was introduced by the amendment of claims 1, 3-16, 21 and 22 herein, and withdrawal of the objection to claims 4-22 is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3 Rejection. In the Non-Final Office Action, Examiner Tran rejected pending claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,001,386 to

Sullivan et al. The Applicant has thoroughly considered Examiner Tran's remarks concerning the patentability of claims 1-3 over *Sullivan*. The Applicant has also thoroughly read *Sullivan*. To warrant this §102(b) rejection of claims 1-3, each and every element as set forth in independent claim 1 must be either expressly or inherently described in *Sullivan*. See, MPEP §2131. The Applicant respectfully traverses this §102(b) rejection of independent claim 1, because *Sullivan* fails to describe, expressly or inherently, "wherein said direct current component (DC) is selected such that a first one of said electrodes (12,13), which is expected to have a lower temperature than the second one of said electrodes (13,12), functions as an anode for said direct current component (DC), while said second electrode (13,12) functions as a cathode for said direct current component (DC)" as set forth in independent claim 1.

Specifically, as shown 2A-3, *Sullivan* teaches applying an alternating current AC (FIGS. 2A and 2C) to electrodes of a discharge lamp FL1 (FIG. 3) and to electrodes of a discharge lamp FL2 (FIG. 3) wherein the alternating current A has a direct current component DC (FIGS. 2B and 2C). However, a careful review of *Sullivan* reveals a failure by *Sullivan* to describe, expressly or inherently, a compensation of a temperature difference between the electrodes of discharge lamp FL1 and a compensation of a temperature difference between the electrodes of discharge lamp FL2. In particular, as related to the aforementioned limitation of independent claim 1, *Sullivan* fails to describe, expressly or inherently, (1) an expectation of one of the electrodes of a discharge lamp (F1 or F2) having a lower temperature than the other electrode of the discharge lamp, and (2) a selection of direct current component DC based on the expected lower temperature electrode functioning as an anode for the direct current component and the other electrode serving as a cathode for the direct current component DC. In fact, *Sullivan* does not even identify the electrodes of discharge lamps FL1 and FL2 in FIG. 3 nor describes the electrodes of discharge lamps FL1 and FL2 in connection with the specification description of FIG. 3. See, *Sullivan* at column 3, line 42 to column 7, line 6.

Clearly, *Sullivan* fails to describe, expressly or inherently, a compensation of a temperature difference between the electrodes of discharge lamp FL1 and a compensation of a

temperature difference between the electrodes of discharge lamp FL2 as encompassed by the aforementioned limitation of independent claim 1.

Withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Sullivan* is therefore respectfully requested.

Claims 2 and 3 depend from independent claim 1. Therefore, dependent claims 2 and 3 include all of the elements and limitations of independent claim 1. It is therefore respectfully submitted by the Applicant that dependent claims 2 and 3 are allowable over *Sullivan* for at least the same reason as set forth herein with respect to independent claim 1 being allowable over *Sullivan*. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims 2 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Sullivan* is therefore respectfully requested.

SUMMARY

The Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-22 as listed herein fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §§102, 103 and 112. In view of the foregoing, favorable consideration and early passage to issue of the present application is respectfully requested. If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, Examiner Tran is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Dated: **June 20, 2007**

Respectfully submitted,
HOLGER MONCH

PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
& STANDARDS
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, New York 10510

Frank Keegan
Registration No. 50,145
Attorney for Applicant

WOODARD, EMHARDT, MORIARITY,
MCNETT, AND HENRY, LLC.
111 Monument Circle, Suite 3700
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-5137

Darrin Wesley Harris
Registration No. 40,636
Attorney for Applicant